

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/089,141	08/14/2002	Marilyn D Resh	D6272	9735
7590 06/22/2004		EXAMINER		
Benjamin Adler			HENLEY III, RAYMOND J	
Adler & Associates 8011 Candle Lane			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Houston, TX 77071			1614	
			DATE MAILED: 06/22/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Art Unit: 1614

CLAIMS 1-16 ARE PRESENTED FOR EXAMINATION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informality:

At page 1 of the specification, below the title, the following should be inserted in order to perfect applicants' claim for priority:

---This is a 371 of PCT/US00/26190 filed September 22, 2000 and claims benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/155,743 filed September 23, 1999.---

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objection

Claims 3-4 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. These claims recite an additional function for 2-bromopalmitate rather than further limit the functions for 2-bromopalmitate as set forth in claim 1. It is suggested that applicants insert ---further--- before the word "inhibits" in claims 3-4 in order to overcome this objection.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 8-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of treating an autoimmune disease in a patient suffering therefrom, does not reasonably provide enablement for broadly treating, for any purpose, an

Art Unit: 1614

individual having a non-specified pathophysiological state. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Insofar as no therapeutic objective to be achieved in the individuals suffering from the non-specified pathophysiological state has been set forth in the claims, the purpose of "treating" is not limited and such reads the use of the claim designated ingredient as a panacea. The art currently is unaware of any single agent, or combination of agents that could be used for the treatment of any and all disease states.

It is suggested that claim 8 be amended to read, in part, "A method for treating an autoimmune disease in a individual suffering therefrom comprising..." in order to overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 3, the term "treatment" does not have antecedent basis. The term "treatment" should be amended to read ---inhibiting--- in order to overcome this point of rejection.

The requirements of claim 7 fail to have antecedent basis in claim 1. The dependency of claim 7 should be changed to claim 6 in order to overcome this point of rejection.

Art Unit: 1614

Claim Rejection - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 8, 10-12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harper et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,714,516, cited by the Examiner) who teaches a method of treating a virus infection in an individual which comprises administering to such an individual an effective amount of 3-bromopalmitic acid or salts thereof as well as compositions which comprise 3-bromopalmitic acid or salts thereof and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier (see the abstract, col. 2, line 26 and col. 2, line 63 – col. 3, line 10).

The biochemical functions as recited in claims 10-12 are deemed inherent in the prior art method because the same host, as required by the present claims, is administered the same active agent.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

Art Unit: 1614

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harper et al., as above.

The differences between the above and the claimed subject matter lie in that the Harper et al. fail to highlight the dosages of present claim 9 and that the host suffers from the conditions of present claims 13-15.

However, to the skilled artisan, the claimed subject matter would have been obvious because the determination of the optimum dosage to employ would have been a matter well within the purview of the skilled artisan and the artisan would have been motivated to do so in order to provide the most effective therapy possible. Also, while Harper et al. teach that the hose suffers from a viral infection, the patentees do not exclude the fact that the host may also suffer from other diseases/disorders which would include the inflammatory conditions as in present claims 13-15.

Accordingly, for the above reasons, the claims are deemed properly rejected and none are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond J Henley III whose telephone number is 571-272-0575. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30 am to 4:00 pm Eastern Time.

Art Unit: 1614

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel can be reached on 571-272-0584. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Raymond J Henley III Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1614

June 17, 2004